

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated May 21, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Allowable Claims

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 6 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 6, and intervening claim 5, and have amended independent claim 9 to include the limitations of claim 12, and intervening claim 11, and canceled claims 5-6 and 11-12 without prejudice. Applicants thus believe that independent claims 1 and 9, and their respective dependent claims, 2-4, 7-8, and 10 are in allowable condition.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-11, 13, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,314 (Jones), newly-cited, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,936,936 (Fisher), previously-cited, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,608,264 (Fouladpour). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 9 as discussed above, and canceled claims 5, 11, 13 and 16 without prejudice. Applicants thus assert that remaining claims 1-3, 7, and 9-10 are in allowable condition.

Claim 4, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones, in view of Fisher, in view of Fouladpour and in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0082341 (Stanforth). Claim 4 depends from claim 1 that has been amended as discussed above and thus claim 4 is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 14-15, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones, in view of Fisher, in view of Fouladpour and in further view of Stanforth. Applicants have canceled claims 14-15 without prejudice, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim 8, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones, in view of Fisher, in view of Fouladpour and

in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,651,328 (Huang). Claim 8 depends from claim 1 that has been amended as discussed above and thus claim 8 is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 17-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Fisher. Applicants have canceled claims 17-19 and 21 without prejudice, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.


Claim 20, which depends from independent claim 17, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones, in view of Fisher, and in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0152285 (Wheeler). Applicants have canceled claim 20 without prejudice, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,


Shane H. Hunter
Reg. No. 41,858

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 858-350-6100
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
SHH:jrl
61076651 v1